UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,204	11/21/2001	Ken Kuwabara	0023-0157	3547

44987 7590 11/19/2009

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER	
LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2476	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/990,204	KUWABARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew C. Lee	2476	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 August 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-12 and 17-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-9 and 13-16* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-12,17-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 08/05/2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2476

_____.

Ayaz Sheikh
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2476

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 10 – 12, 17 – 33 are pending.

Claims 1 – 9, 13 – 16 were canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 27 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson et al. (US 7023846 B1) in view of Kadambi et al. (US 7103055 B2).

Regarding claim 10, Andersson et al. disclose a method of configuring a networking device *("label switching router" interpreted as a networking device; col. 3, lines 65 – 67, col. 4, lines 1 – 4)*, comprising: generating a first forwarding table *("element 240 incoming forwarding table and based upon the network layer addressing information in the packet, and adds the new label to its incoming forwarding table" interpreted as generating a first forwarding table; Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 31 – 36, col. 6, lines 59 – 67, col. 7, lines 1 – 2)*; generating a second forwarding table *("element 260 outgoing forwarding table, and allocates a new label, and adds the new label to its outgoing forwarding table" correlates to generating a second forwarding table; Fig. 2,*

col. 2, lines 31 – 36, col. 5, lines 22 – 27); Andersson et al. also imply or suggest programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions *("incoming packet processing logic and label detection logic" correlates to programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table; col. 1, lines 56 – 66, col. 4, lines 43 – 56, col. 10, lines 22 – 49; Fig. 2, Fig. 11);* programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions *(col. 4, lines 56 – 65).*

Andersson et al. do not explicitly teach programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions *(Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 6, "Filter on ingress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52; col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44)*; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions (*Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 5, 17 – 7, "Filter on Egress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52* ; *col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44).*

At time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Andersson et al. to include the features of programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions as taught by Kadambi et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so for providing a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Regarding claim 11, Andersson et al. disclose the method claimed where the generating a first forwarding table comprises generating a first forwarding table containing an entry corresponding to a first label switched path *(col. 4, lines 50 – 60; col. 6, lines 61 – 67, col. 7, lines 1 – 2; Fig. 2, Fig. 3A, referenced the packet includes label switching information that is associated with an LSP mapped in the incoming forwarding table).*

Regarding claim 12, Andersson et al. disclose the method claimed where the generating a second forwarding table comprises generating a second forwarding table *(col. 4, lines 60 – 65, col. 5, lines 22 – 27; Fig. 2, Fig. 3B, referenced determines whether the packet is associated with an LSP mapped in the outgoing forwarding table).*

Regarding claim 17, Andersson et al. disclose a networking device *("label switching router" as networking device; col. 3, lines 65 – 67, col. 4, lines 1 – 4)*; a memory for storing a first forwarding table and a second forwarding table *(col. 2, lines 31 – 36, "storage medium….RAM"; interpreted as a memory for storing; col. 12, lines 1 – 8; Fig. 2, element 240 incoming forwarding table as first forwarding table, element 260 outgoing forwarding table as second forwarding table);* Andersson et al. also imply or suggests a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets a first set of conditions *("incoming packet processing logic and label detection logic" interpreted as programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table; col. 4, lines 43 – 56, col. 10, lines 22 – 49; Fig. 11)* and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions *(col. 4, lines 56 – 65).*

Andersson et al. do not explicitly teach a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets a first set of conditions and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teache a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets a first set of conditions *(Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 6, "Filter on ingress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52; col.*

20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44) and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions (*Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 5, 17 – 7, "Filter on Egress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52* ; *col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44)*.

At time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Andersson et al. to include the features of a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets a first set of conditions and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value does not meet one or more conditions of the first set of conditions as taught by Kadambi et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so for providing a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Regarding claim 18, Andersson et al. disclose the networking device claimed where the first forwarding table contains an entry corresponding to a first label switched path *("the logic set up the LSP by adding the new label to the incoming forwarding table"; col. 7, lines 10 – 17).*

Regarding claim 19, Andersson et al. disclose the networking device claimed where the second forwarding table contains an entry corresponding to a second label

switched path *("the logic allocates a new label for the new LSP, and sets up the new LSP by adding the new label to the outgoing forwarding table; col. 5, lines 32 – 42; Fig. 2, Fig. 3A).*

Regarding claim 20, Andersson et al. disclose the networking *device ("label switching router" as networking device; col. 3, lines 65 – 67, col. 4, lines 1 – 4);* Andersson et al. also disclose ingress interface for receiving packet *("element 210 incoming interface" as ingress interface; col. 4, lines 43 – 44; Fig 2);* egress interface for transmitting packet *("element 230, outgoing interface" as egress interface; col. 4, lines 47 – 48);* wherein each of the lookup operations results in an identification of an egress interface from which the received packet is to be transmitted *(col. 4, lines 45 – 65, Fig. 3A).*

Andersson et al. teach ingress interface and egress interface *("incoming interface and outgoing interface; Fig. 2)*, but do not teach explicitly a plurality of ingress interfaces for receiving packets; a plurality of egress of egress interfaces for transmitting packets.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach a plurality of ingress interfaces for receiving packets; a plurality of egress interfaces for transmitting packets *(Fig. 1, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 7 – 12, lines 22 – 29, col. 6, lines 7 – 21).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Andersson et al. to include the features of a plurality of ingress interfaces for receiving packets; a plurality of egress interfaces for transmitting packets as taught by Kadambi et al. in order to provide a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port

interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Regarding claim 27, Andersson et al. disclose a method of configuring a networking device *("label switching router" interpreted as a networking device; col. 3, lines 65 – 67, col. 4, lines 1 – 4),* comprising: generating a first forwarding table (*("element 240 incoming forwarding table and based upon the network layer addressing information in the packet, and adds the new label to its incoming forwarding table" interpreted as generating a first forwarding table; Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 31 – 36, col. 6, lines 59 – 67, col. 7, lines 1 – 2*) except including information identifying a first plurality of egress interface ports; generating a second forwarding table (*("element 260 outgoing forwarding table, and allocates a new label, and adds the new label to its outgoing forwarding table" correlates to generating a second forwarding table; Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 31 – 36, col. 5, lines 22 – 27)* except including information identifying a second plurality of egress interface ports; Andersson et al. also suggest implicitly programming a filter to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions *("incoming packet processing logic and label detection logic" correlates to programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table; col. 1, lines 56 – 66, col. 4, lines 43 – 56, col. 10, lines 22 – 49; Fig. 2, Fig. 11)*; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if a first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions *(col. 4, lines 56 – 65).*

However, Andersson et al. do not disclose explicitly including information identifying a first plurality of egress interface ports, including information identifying a second plurality of egress interface ports, and programming a filter to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if a first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach including information identifying a first plurality of egress interface ports, and including information identifying a second plurality of egress interface ports *(Fig. 1, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 7 – 12, lines 22 – 29, col. 6, lines 7 – 21),* and programming a filter to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions *(Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 6, "Filter on ingress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52; col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44)*; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if a first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions (*Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 5, 17 – 7, "Filter on Egress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52* ; *col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44).*

At time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Andersson et al. to include the features of including information identifying a first plurality of egress interface ports,

including information identifying a second plurality of egress interface ports, and programming a filter to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions; programming the filter to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if a first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions as taught by Kadambi et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so for providing a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Regarding claim 28, Andersson et al. disclose the method claimed where generating a first forwarding table comprises generating a first forwarding table containing an entry corresponding to a first label switched path (*Fig. 3A, col. 5, lines 63 – 67, col. 6, lines 1 – 5; Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 6 – 34).*

Regarding claim 29, Andersson et al. disclose the method claimed where generating a second forwarding table comprises generating a second forwarding table containing an entry corresponding to a second label switched path *(Fig. 3B, col. 6, lines 35 – 41, Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 6 – 34).*

Regarding claim 30, Andersson et al. disclose a networking device *("label switching router" interpreted as a networking device; col. 3, lines 65 – 67, col. 4, lines 1 – 4)* comprising: a memory *("tangible storage medium"; col. 12, lines 1 – 8, 30 – 47)* for storing a first forwarding table and a second forwarding table *(Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 31 –*

36, col. 6, lines 59 – 67, col. 7, lines 1 – 2, ; Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 31 – 36, col. 5, lines 22 – 27), except the first forwarding table and the second forwarding table including information identifying a plurality of egress interfaces; and Andersson et al. suggest implicitly a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions *("incoming packet processing logic and label detection logic" correlates to programming a filter to perform a lookup operation in the first forwarding table; col. 1, lines 56 – 66, col. 4, lines 43 – 56, col. 10, lines 22 – 49; Fig. 2, Fig. 11)* and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions (*col. 4, lines 56 – 65).*

However, Andersson et al. do not disclose explicitly the first forwarding table and the second forwarding table including information identifying a plurality of egress interfaces; and a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach the first forwarding table and the second forwarding table including information identifying a plurality of egress interfaces, including information identifying a second plurality of egress interface ports *(Fig. 1, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 7 – 12, lines 22 – 29, col. 6, lines 7 – 21)*, and a filter

programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions *(Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 6, "Filter on ingress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52; col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44)*; to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions (*Fig. 14, col. 20, lines 46 – 56, Fig. 17, elements 17 – 1 to 17 – 5, 17 – 7, "Filter on Egress port"; col. 22, lines 22 – 52* ; *col. 20, lines 65 – 67, col. 21, lines 1 – 15, lines 25 – 44)*.

At time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Andersson et al. to include the features of the first forwarding table and the second forwarding table including information identifying a plurality of egress interfaces; and a filter programmed to initiate a lookup operation in the first forwarding table if a first field value of a header contained in a received packet meets one or more conditions of a first set of conditions and to initiate a lookup operation in the second forwarding table if the first field value meets one or more conditions of a second set of conditions as taught by Kadambi et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so for providing a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Regarding claim 31, Andersson et al. disclose the networking device claimed where the first forwarding table contains an entry corresponding to a first label switched path *(Fig. 3A, col. 5, lines 63 – 67, col. 6, lines 1 – 5; Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 6 – 34).*

Regarding claim 32, Andersson et al. disclose the networking device claimed where the second forwarding table contains an entry corresponding to a second label switched path *(Fig. 3B, col. 6, lines 35 – 41, Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 6 – 34).*

Regarding claim 33, although Andersson et al. disclose the networking device claimed ingress interface and egress interface (Fig.2), Andersson et al. do not disclose explicitly a plurality of ingress interfaces for receiving packets; the plurality of egress interfaces for transmitting packets, wherein each of the lookup operations results in an identification of an egress interface from which the received packet is to be transmitted.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach a plurality of ingress interfaces for receiving packets; the plurality of egress interfaces for transmitting packets, wherein each of the lookup operations results in an identification of an egress interface from which the received packet is to be transmitted *(Fig. 1, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 7 – 12, lines 22 – 29, col. 6, lines 7 – 21)*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Andersson et al. to include the features of a plurality of ingress interfaces for receiving packets; the plurality of egress interfaces for transmitting packets, wherein each of the lookup operations results in an identification of an egress interface from which the received packet is to be transmitted as taught by Kadambi et al. in order to provide a network switch for network

communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

4. Claims 21 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal et al. (US 6330614 B1) in view of Kadambi et al. (US 7103055 B2).

Regarding claim 21, Aggarwal et al. disclose in a router containing a plurality of forwarding tables *(elements 1, 2, 3, 4, Fig. 4)*, a method of packet forwarding, comprising: receiving a packet at an ingress interface *("gets a datagram from a directly connected interface" interpreted as receiving a packet at an ingress interface; col. 4, lines 63 – 67)*; classifying the received packet based on at least a first field value contained in the header of the packet *("examining the destination network address in the header"; col. 5, lines 1 - 8)*; performing a lookup operation in the associated forwarding table according to at least a second field value contained in the header of the packet *(col. 6, lines 49 – 55);* determining an egress interface based on the lookup operation *(col. 6, lines 52 – 55);* and transmitting the received packet from the determined egress interface *("to find the next interface to which to send the datagram"; col. 5, lines 1 – 8, col. 6, lines 52 – 55)*, Aggarwal et al. suggest implicitly associating one of the plurality of forwarding tables to the packet according to its classification *("examining the datagram header and looking up the Forwarding Table to find"; col. 5, lines 1 – 8, ….the Forwarding Tables on a backbone Routers can extended to tens of thousands of entries….; col. 6, lines 49 – 65).*

Aggarwal et al. do not disclose explicitly associating one of the plurality of forwarding tables to the packet according to its classification.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach associating one of the plurality of forwarding tables to the packet according to its classification *(Fig. 20, Fig. 21, col. 35, lines 27 – 54).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Aggarwal et al. to include the features of associating one of the plurality of forwarding tables to the packet according to its classification as taught by Kadambi et al. in order to provide a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Regarding claim 22, Aggarwal et al. disclose the method claimed where the classifying comprises determining whether the first field value meets one or more criteria *("verifies the integrity of the incoming datagram header"; Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 49 – 55).*

Regarding claim 23, Aggarwal et al. disclose the method claimed where the classifying further comprises assigning a default classification if none of the criteria are met *(col. 6, lines 11 – 25, lines 49 – 65, col. 7, lines 18 – 28).*

Regarding claim 24, Aggarwal et al. disclose the method claimed where a first forwarding table contains an entry corresponding to a first label switched path *("MPLS"; Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 19 – 51, Fig. 5, col. 12, lines 13 – 23).*

Regarding claim 25, Aggarwal et al. disclose the method claimed where the first forwarding table contains an entry corresponding to a second label switched path *("MPLS"; Fig. 4, col. 8, lines 19 – 51, Fig. 5, col. 12, lines 13 – 23).*

Regarding claim 26, Aggarwal et al. disclose in a networking device, a method of forwarding packets *("exchanging information…"; col. 2, lines 27 – 42)*, comprising: classifying a received packet based on information contained in the packet *("examining the destination network address in the header"; col. 5, lines 1 – 8);* ; performing a lookup operation using the selected forwarding table *(col. 6, lines 49 – 55);* and determining an egress interface for the packet based on the performed lookup operation *("to find the next interface to which to send the datagram"; col. 5, lines 1 – 8, col. 6, lines 52 – 55).*

Aggarwal et al. suggest implicitly selecting one of a plurality of forwarding tables based on the classification of the received packet *("examining the datagram header and looking up the Forwarding Table to find"; col. 5, lines 1 – 8, ….the Forwarding Tables on a backbone Routers can extended to tens of thousands of entries….; col. 6, lines 49 – 65).*

Aggarwal et al. do not disclose explicitly selecting one of a plurality of forwarding tables based on the classification of the received packet.

Kadambi et al. in the same field of endeavor teach selecting one of a plurality of forwarding tables based on the classification of the received packet *(Fig. 20, Fig. 21, col. 35, lines 27 – 54).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Aggarwal et al. to include the features of selecting one of a plurality of forwarding tables based on the classification of the received packet as taught by Kadambi et al. in order to provide a network switch for network communications, wherein the network switch includes at least one data port interface supporting a plurality of data ports transmitting and receiving data at a first data rate and a second data rate *(as suggested by Kadambi et al., see col. 2, lines 57 – 61).*

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/05/2009 with respect to claims 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 – 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a) Carpini et al. (US 7126907 B2).
b) Hama (US 7072346 B2).
c) Jagannath et al. (US 7095740 B1).
d) Chin et al. (5617421).
e) Gobuyan et al. (5917821).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew C Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 2476
<1Qy10:11/15/2009>

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2476